

## **REMARKS**

### **1. Status of Claims**

Claims 1-6 and 13-26 were pending in the Application. Applicants have amended claims 1, 15 and 23 and canceled claim 24 without prejudice or disclaimer. A Request for Continued Examination (RCE) and fee is submitted herewith. Applicants respectfully request entry of the above amendments and consideration of the enclosed remarks. Applicants submit that no new matter is added. Accordingly, claims 1-6, 13-23, and 25-26 will remain pending in the application.

### **2. Claim Objections**

In section 3 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 16 at line 7. However, claim 16 does not have a 7<sup>th</sup> line.

In section 4 of the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 23 and 24. Applicants have amended claim 23 and canceled claim 24 without prejudice or disclaimer.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objections.

### **3. Rejections under 35 USC § 112**

In section 6 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claim 15 as allegedly failing to comply with a written description requirement.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection since the claim is supported by paragraph 0047 and 0041. However, solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 15 without prejudice or disclaimer and the rejection is moot.

Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

**4. Rejections under 35 USC § 103(a)**

In section 8 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 – 6, 13-22 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. US 7,089,288 B2 to Gossweiler, et al. (“Gossweiler ‘288”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0131959 A1 by Thorman, et al. (“Thorman ‘959”).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claims 1 and 15. Therefore, the rejection is moot.

Additionally, with reference to claims 1 and 15, the cited references do not teach or suggest such a physical sensor associated with the user and a physical token. The cited references do not teach or describe a physical sensor associated with the particular token and virtual document so that it can report physical interaction such as touch applied to the token, but merely describe id tags and physical items. Moreover, the cited references do not teach or suggest an instrumented association bin. As described in the passage cited by the Examiner at Gossweiler ‘288, Col. 6, lines 14-36, the reference requires a user to type in associations and does not use an instrumented association bin.

The dependent claims 2-6, 13-14, 16-22 and 25-26 are patentable over the cited references for at least the reasons described herein with reference to the associated independent claim and any associated intervening claims.

Furthermore, with regard to claims 2-6, the cited references do not teach or suggest the sensor model instance as presently claimed.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-6, 13-22 and 25-26 are patentable over the cited references and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

In section 9 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 23-24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly rendered obvious by U.S. Patent No. US 7,089,288 B2 to

Gossweiler, et al. ("Gossweiler '288") in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0131959 A1 by Thorman, et al. ("Thorman '959") and further in view of Want.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. However, solely to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended claim 15 and canceled claim 24 without prejudice or disclaimer. Therefore, the rejection is moot, and Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-6, 13-23 and 25-26 are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections.

#### **5. Conclusion Of Remarks**

For at least the reasons stated above, it is respectfully submitted that the claims of this application are in condition for allowance and early and favorable action thereon is requested.

If the Examiner believes that additional issues may be resolved by a telephone interview, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney for Applicant at (203) 924-3180.

#### **6. Authorization**

No fee is believed due with this response. However, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required for the response or credit any overpayment to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-870.

In the event that an extension of time or additional extension of time is required to make this response timely filed, the Commissioner is requested to grant a petition for that extension of time which is required to make this response timely. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee for such an extension of time or

credit any overpayment for an extension of time to the Pitney Bowes, Inc. Deposit  
Account Number 16-1885, Order No. F-870.

Respectfully submitted,

/George M. Macdonald/

---

George M. Macdonald  
Reg. No. 39,284  
Attorney for Applicant  
Telephone (203) 924-3180  
PITNEY BOWES INC.  
Intellectual Property and Technology Law Department  
35 Waterview Drive, P.O. Box 3000  
Shelton, CT 06484-8000